Mr. Steven D. Hill
Sr. V.P. Trade & Reference Pub. Division
Houghton Mifflin
222 Berkeley St.,
Boston, MA 02116

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702
8/4/97

Dear Mr. Hill,

In this letter and what accompanies it I ask nothing of you. I seek only to inform you. I believe this serves Houghton Mifflin's interest and that of the country. If I were not certain of this I would not at this stage of my life be taking this time and going to this trouble. I am 84 and have been so successful in overcoming so long a list of normally fatal illnesses several of my doctors state their "amazement" when they see me. These illnesses have left me feeble, however, and as you can see, from them my typing is bad and I apologize for that.

I seek to inform you because it has been announced that you are to publish a book supposedly on the Warren Commission next year, by Max Holland.

As to my qualifications on this subject, I wrote the first book on that Commission and that assassination 32 years ago. I have written eight on that subject since then. These are all severely critical of many on the Commission and in the executive agencies but to this day I have yet to get a letter or phone call from any of them complaining of either unfairness or inaccuracy. In one of a dozen or so FOIA lawsuits I filed to obtain withheld assassination information the FBI stated that I knew more about the subject than anyone working for it. The pertinent pages of that filing are attached as Exhibit 3.

Through those lawsuits I obtained about a quarter of a million JFK Assassination and Commission records. I have always made them freely available to all writing the field, including Max Holland and his former partner, Kai Bird, as you will also see in the enclosure.

Most people do not think in these terms and I never hear anyone say it but the fact is that in this country the assassination of any president is a de facto coup d'etat. I regard that as the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours. I believe it cannot be addressed responsibly other than on the basis of what official fact is available. It cannot be addressed responsibly by those who regard themselves as deep thinkers and of intellectual endowment denied others without using this fact, not any theory, as the basis for what their self-concepts and beliefs and perhaps preconceptions persuades them to put on paper and use to influence others. It is not possible to address the Commission without the most detailed knowledge of its record and of the information it had, its files, both about the assassination rather than official behavior or special interpretations of that.

As Max Holland did in American Heritage last year.

In it he argued, literally, that the Commission was right because it was wrong!

And that over what had no relationsip to the assassination itself!

This nonsense, while American Heritage stated he was expanding into a book, was largely cribbed by a member of the Assassination Records Review Board. That and what he wrote about me led me to write the lengthy enclosure copies of which I have sent to that board, which is required to make all its records public when it ends its work, and to the dean of the law school whose Review published that article, which is partisan at the least and is permeated by subject-matter ignorance.

As you will also see in what I enclose, three Members of the Warren Commission disagreed with the basis of the Report, two leaving records that they were adamant about this. They were, as you will see, deceived into believing that their disagreement was incorporated in the Report, as it was not. On this also you will find exhibits, official documents.

I had a relationship with one of those Members, Senator Richard Russell. All I have published is without any theories and comes only from the official assassination information. To emphasize that all of this was public I used as exhibits pages of my books with the official citations. The books, of course, did much of the work for others who research the subject.

Beginning with the first of my Whitewash series, which dates to 1965, all I have published is the official fact about the assassination. There is nothing imagined in any of these nine books, which remain standard in the field. This is quite unlike what Holland wrote in American Heritage. That was what he imagines and there is not a single fact about the assassination in it. What he images has no relationship of any kind to the assassination and it was not a factor of any kind in the Commission's Report.

I do hope you will read this. If you have any questions, to the degree now possible for me I will answer them.

If you do not want to keep what I enclose, I will appreciate the return of it because xeroxing is a problem for me and because others come here to use my files. They will be a permanent, free collegiate archive when I can no longer make them available to others.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

On the previous page I say that what Holland imagines was not a factor in the Commission's Report. That understates too much. It was not a factpr of any kind in the Commission's work. At Holland's request I provided him with transcripts of the Commission's Top Secret executive sessions. They were so secret even the staff was not allowed to be present. There was not even a mention of ~~hi~~ what Holland imagines into a book in any of them, as he knew. As the enclosed reports.

The enclosed is a copy of a retyped rough draft of one of quite a few manuscripts in rough draft form that I leave as a record for our history, with deposits in a number of colleges and universities.

No publisher commissioned any book other than in support of the official assassination mythology, significant an even as that assassination was in our national life. The first book, mine, got over 100 rejections internationally without a single adverse editorial comment. In the end that made me the country's smallest publisher. With this the publisher and the major-media attitude, when it became impossible for me to continue publishing my books I started preparing these manuscripst as records for our history.

I hope you will not contribute to what we have had too much of, deceiving and misleading the people on this subject. Any support of the Warren Commission or of its Report inevitably does this. I think the documentation of the enclosed manuscript should reflect this to you.

HW